

**Minutes**  
**Environmental Cooperation Pilot Program - Advisory Group**  
**April 12, 2000**

The meeting was held in Room P449, Public Service Building, 231 W. Michigan St. Milwaukee, WI from 12:00 PM to 3:00 PM, Wednesday, April 12, 2000

**Present:** Caryl Terrell (Sierra Club); Randy Nedrelo (Northern Engraving); Brian Borofka (Wisconsin Electric/ WI Environmental Working Group); John Piotrowski (Packaging Corp. of America); Karen Bender (Nestle Food); Marilou Martin (EPA)

**Absent:** Michael Ricciardi (MGE); Michael Gromacki (Cook Composites and; Matt Redmann (Navistar); (Commerce).

**Also Present:** Jon Heinrich, facilitator (WDNR); Lynn Persson, note-taker (WDNR); Laurel Sukup (WDNR); John Shenot (WDNR), Jerry Rodenberg (WDNR); Michael Simpson, (Environmental Management Solutions); Scott Lee (WDNR), Steve Skavroneck (Citizens for a Better Environment)

**Action Item Summary**

**Next Meeting (to be confirmed):**

- Thursday, June 1. At Stoughton (Karen Bender , Nestle Food offered to host 11:30 to 4:00 pm)

**Action Items**

- 1) *Update DNR Web Site to include agendas and minutes* --- (Lynn Persson will work with Tracy Fretwell to accomplish)
- 2) *UNC Database* --- check to see what information will be available that can help with program performance measures and when (Marilou Martin)
- 3) *Annual Report* --- Brian Borofka will work with DNR workgroup to develop a template for a meaningful annual report (proposed template out to committee by May 24<sup>th</sup>. Schedule and responsibilities for preparation developed by (June 1, 2000)
- 4) *Staff Contacts*--- DNR will clarify who is the primary staff contact for Nestle Food and let committee members know who the acting Bureau Director will be as soon as possible (Jon Heinrich)
- 5) *Performance Table* --- Need to add narrative to explain. Companies and DNR need to identify responsibilities for who will measure. Steps:
  - a) Scott Lee will get out the workgroups analysis of what parameters DNR will be monitoring as soon as possible
  - b) Scott Lee and John Shenot will provide narrative to committee by May 5, 2000.
  - c) Companies and Workgroup members should review the chart and indicate what they believe they will be measuring in their projects by May 19<sup>th</sup> (Email or fax to John Heinrich)
  - d) Workgroup will revise table and send to Committee by May 24 (i.e. prior to June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting)
- 6) *Information on other EPA and State Innovative Programs* --- Marilou Martin said she would provide information on other EPA innovative programs at future committee meetings. Also will directly forward to information that is time sensitive between meetings.
- 7) *Email list* --- DNR staff resurrect the email list for people who indicated an interest in cooperative agreement committee, but were not directly on the committee so they get information about future (Lynn work with Jon Heinrich to do).
- 8) *Next Meeting* --- Jon Heinrich will work with Karen Bender to provide information on next meeting

## **April 12, 2000 Meeting Summary:**

### **Opening Remarks – Membership status, agenda review and repair / DNR**

John Shenot gave a brief update on Lynda. Her cancer has returned and she will be retiring from DNR. DNR administration will appoint an acting Bureau Director who will likely serve in that capacity for at least the next 3 to 5 months. Until the appointment, Lynda's boss, Craig Karr, will be a point of contact for the Bureau and DNR project contacts should be the point of liaison on individual Environmental Cooperative Agreement projects. Jon Heinrich noted that Lynda Wiese has had a strong commitment to the program and has offered to consult on the program during the transition period. Everyone expressed their concern about Lynda and asked for her address.

### **Review and provide any final revisions to draft minutes from 2/16/00 meeting / DNR**

There were no comments on the minutes. Steve Skavroneck asked that minutes and agendas from recent meeting be added to the DNR web site.

□ **Follow-up:** *Action Item 1.*

### **Program Performance & Evaluation Report (see Brian Borofka outline) / Brian Borofka**

Brian Borofka explained that he believes Cooperative Environmental Agreement Program Success can be best measured and explained to others based on:

- 1) Number of facilities in the Program
- 2) Lessons learned by both the companies and the government (i.e., DNR, EPA)
- 3) Administrative changes resulting from the Agreements
- 4) Benefits to the:
  - Natural environment
  - Economic environment
  - Social environment

He then went over the key potential benefits to the Natural, Economic and Social Environment as he saw them potentially applying to Wisconsin Electric facilities (Attachment A).

Brian suggested that the Annual Report on the Cooperative Environmental Agreement Program would have more impact if it succinctly reports on the results of the program using these types of measures.

The committee then discussed what to do with the measures and how Brian's proposed measures should be used in designing the programs annual report. Caryl Terrell said it looks like a very fine list. Brian Borofka said that companies are looking at really better measuring and showing environmental benefits. Marilou Martin asked whether these are collectible and measurable factors? Caryl Terrell noted we should clarify whether we are trying to measure the progress of individual pilots and then sum them to evaluate the entire program. Also need to identify what

is our starting point. Steve Skavroneck noted that the projects are hard to aggregate and may be better to compare results between projects.

The committee noted that measuring and reporting progress in the program will happen in several ways.

- Individual Agreement's Performance Reports
- Annual Program Performance Report to the Legislature
- November 2003 5-Year Report Program Report to the Legislature

Documents needs to be:

- Learning document
- Benefits document

Marilou Martin noted that there is a difference between facts and analysis. Analysis can include benefits to facilities itself, benefits to the environment, to DNR and how they relate to initial expectations. Brian noted it is important we learn from what is going on. Caryl Terrell asked what is happening to the baseline data companies submitted to North Carolina. Is there going to be any analysis that will be useful to our report?

#### **□ Follow-up: Action Item 2**

Caryl Terrell noted it would be desirable that the performance measures developed in this pilot program are also used to measure other voluntary partnership programs. There is ongoing concern that the public is excluded from the P3 Agreement with the paper industry. She would like to see more public involvement in all agreements and insure that public concerns are included in performance measures.

Scot Lee noted that the internal work group identified some parameters that should be measured internal to DNR (such as workload and efficiency)

Lynn Persson suggested that facilities and project contacts consider using the existing pollution prevention case study format to summarize the results of individual agreement project. The format already includes economic and environmental reporting parameters and might be easily modified to include some of the other factors being measured as part of the cooperative agreements.

The report needs to be out in November and will probably take 2 to 3 months to produce. We need to identify Who/What/Where/When.

Brian Borofka noted that staff may be spending too much time trying to figure out how to measure and report on the program. More time needs to be spent by DNR and EPA on getting draft agreement out. Implementation is most important. The statute was passed 2 ½ years ago and we do not having an agreement done.

Karen Bender indicated she is feeling a lot of frustration about the program. It is hard to not have a contact. Her company has facilities all over the state and is not sure who her contact is. If I had to report out today I would say ---lessons learned – it is not working. It has been expensive, frustrating and not accomplished a lot.

Marilou Martin noted we can't hide the negative responses and experiences. We want to identify problems, figure out ways of solving them if, possible, and learn from them.

- ❑ **Follow-up: Action Item 3**
- ❑ **Follow-up: Action Item 4**

## **Review/Receive comments on Performance Factors Table /(Scott Lee)**

Scott Lee provided an update on the performance table that the work group has been working on. It noted that the workgroup had identified a list of items that it appears will not be measured by the companies or NC.

Committee members had a number of questions on the table. They asked for narrative explanation of the table that includes

- 1) Use of table need to be identified
- 2) Clarify responsibilities for collecting and reporting on parameters.

Brian Borofka noted that the table was initially developed as a menu to choose from, rather than dictatorial requirements. There are 14 factors from legislation. That is the genesis of this table. How to we measure these items for specific projects? John Shenot noted that the first column contains statutory guidelines for the overall program rather than individual projects. Which of these objectives apply to a particular project will be negotiated in each individual agreement.

Marilou Martin noted that EPA thought that superior environmental performance is part of each company's responsibility. We will need to identify what are core agreements measurements versus program goals.

Caryl Terrell noted that all the collection tools are from the facility. How is DNR going to measure? DNR tools and responsibility. Scott Lee said the workgroup had been struggling with that issue and had put some preliminary ideas together. The committee members asked workgroup to share this information.

- ❑ **Follow-up: Action Item 5**

## **Report on support of the WI Program / EPA (Marilou Martin)**

EPA has been looked carefully at Cook Composites and will shortly send DNR a letter clarifying EPA's thoughts on the best way to proceed on the project. EPA has also met with other companies to discuss their projects.

This is an experiment. There are high transition costs on experiments. They take a lot of time for DNR, EPA, and the company. The effort needs to be transparent. As a pilot program we have to endure the greatest microscope.

You should be aware that EPA is working on a National Performance Track. Program. It is a build off of environmental leadership program and goes beyond compliance. It will be announced in June by Brawnier. On April 27<sup>th</sup> there will be a meeting to discuss performance indicators for the program. Companies should have received information about the meeting. Would like to have state representative at the afternoon meeting. EPA is looking at the same kind of issues and as part of Regulatory Policy Reinvention --- Performance Tracks.

Looking at two levels

- More a recognition level than a flexibility level
- Next level more reinvention.

Note that EPA Region V does not endorse ISO14000 in particular, but rather supports EMS. Committee members noted that Joan Girard was at the last advisory committee meeting and mentioned a training program another EPA Region developed to help small metal finishers develop EMS systems. How do we learn about these initiatives and possibly have similar opportunities in Region V. Marilou Martin noted that different EPA regions have different initiatives. Marilou will be glad to share information about different EPA EMS and innovation initiatives at future meetings.

EPA has learned from the XL project and EPA has made changes as a result. EPA has set up an Innovations Action Council with Deputy Administrators on it. The result will be systems change. For example while the individual Minnesota XL project did not appear to be successful it did impact how new MACT standards were written for magnetic tape.

❑ **Follow-up: Action Item 6**

**Next Meeting (to be confirmed):**

**Thursday, June 1. 11:30 to 4:00pm at Stoughton (Karen Bender , Nestle Food offered to host)**

Preliminary Agenda:

- 1) Update DNR Website
- 2) UNC Database Marilou – Region 5
- 3) Meaningful annual report – Brian & internal workgroup will outline what the report should look like and who should be responsible.
- 4) Performance table
- 5) Discussion of: (tentative)
  - Update on different projects
  - What is the life of the group

Several people asked that the email list for people who indicated an interest in cooperative agreement committee, but were not directly on the committee, be resurrected so that they can receive copies of the minutes, handouts and agendas.

❑ **Follow-up: Action Item 7**

❑ **Follow-up: Action Item 8**

---

***Lynn Persson***

Wisconsin DNR  
Bureau of Cooperative Environmental Assistance  
Box 7921, Madison, WI 53707

Phone: (608)267-3763 Fax: (608)267-0496  
Email: [perssl@dnr.state.wi.us](mailto:perssl@dnr.state.wi.us)